UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,620	09/23/2003	David J. Smith	026808-002000US	2187

20350 7590 08/27/2009

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
MEUCCI, MICHAEL D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/668,620	SMITH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL D. MEUCCI	2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 September 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-14,16,17,19,20,22-26 and 28-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-14,16,17,19,20,22-26 and 28-3* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 September 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed 25 September 2008.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22-26, and 28-33 are currently pending.

3. Claims 6, 15, 18, 21, and 27 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16, 20, 22-26 and 28-31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas et al. (U.S. 2003/0061335 A1) hereinafter referred to as Thomas in view of Nevarez et al. (U.S. 6,609,158 B1) hereinafter referred to as Nevarez.

a. Regarding claim 1, Thomas teaches: a housing (server computer 16 in Fig. 2 and paragraph [0022] on page 2); a first I/O device configured to couple to the electric equipment (paragraph [0017] on page 2 and interface card 18 of Fig. 2); a monitor coupled to the first I/O device and configured to determine information regarding the electric equipment (paragraphs [0017] and [0021] of page 2 and inter-process server 52 of Fig. 2); a second I/O device (interface card 20 of Fig. 2) configured to communicate with a computer via the communication network, the monitor being

configured to provide the information regarding the electric equipment to the communication network via the second I/O device (paragraph [0019] on page 2 and paragraphs [0022-0023] on pages 2-3); a memory that stores a computer-executable program configured to be executed by the computer to provide a computer interface for providing indicia of the information regarding the electric equipment, the computer interface being in a format that is distinct from a network browser format. (paragraphs [0022-0023] on pages 2-3); and an interface-provisioning device coupled to the memory and the second I/O device and configured to convey the computer-executable program toward the computer via the second I/O device and the communication network (paragraph [0003] on page 1 and paragraph [0022-0023] on page 2-3 and HMI module 64 in Fig. 2); wherein each of the first and second I/O devices, the monitor, the memory, and the interface-provisioning device are disposed at least partially in the housing (paragraph [0017] and Fig. 1 and 2).

Thomas does not explicitly teach: the second I/O device communicating with a remote computer; the program being executed by a remote computer; and conveying the program toward the remote computer. However, Nevarez discloses: "A remote provider 246 provides object access through a remote bridge 248 and the UCS product 224. The remote provider 246 may provide access, for instance, to an OLE component 236 by using remoting technology to get through to a Windows NT or OLE server 106. This may include tunneling through an "NSAPI" Netscape web server API and/or an "ISAPI" Windows NT web server API. The remote provider 230 accepts calls from the object model adapter 246, uses standard network technology such as the remote bridge

248 to contact remote objects, and relays parameters and results. The remote provider 230 may communicate via the network with another remote provider 246 at the remote location, or it may communicate with another object model provider (e.g., provider 242, 238, or 232), or with remote UCS product code as illustrated," (lines 39-53 of column 10, wherein the Remote Provider 246 is the second I/O unit which provides the program to a remote computer through remoting technology such as tunneling). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the second I/O device communicate with a remote computer; have the program executed by a remote computer; and convey the program toward the remote computer. "In short, the UCS architecture 200, like the inventive architecture in other embodiments, provides versatility by letting a programmer use any programming language in the system to access any reusable component in the system," (lines 63-66 of column 10); and "The UCS architecture 200 thus provides a middle-tier solution for development on the NetWare platform. It makes the existing NetWare services relatively easy to consume and build into Internet and intranet solutions, and it provides an open standards-based solution. Because components may be run on either the local server or on a remote server, developers can use components that do not exist in the local execution environment. Remoting of components may be done through an event-passing protocol that leverages Web technologies such as TCP/IP," (lines 11-20 of column 11). It is for these reasons that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the second I/O device communicate with a remote computer; have the program executed by a remote

computer; and convey the program toward the remote computer in the system as taught by Thomas.

b. Regarding claims 2-5, 7, and 8, Thomas teaches: the program is configured to provide an interface when executed, the program comprises the interface application; the program is configured to obtain the interface application, the program is configured to determine whether a desired version of an interface application is stored by the computer and if not, then to obtain the interface application, the interface is a Windows-based interface, and the monitor and the interface-provisioning device comprise software code (paragraphs [0022-0023] on page 2-3). Thomas does not explicitly teach "remote" computers. However, this limitation is discussed above in claim 1.

c. Regarding claim 10, Thomas teaches: the monitor is configured to determine information regarding at least one of air-conditioning equipment, a smart generator, a leak detector, a power distribution unit, an environmental monitoring device, and an automatic transfer switch (paragraphs [0003-0008] on page 1).

d. Claims 11-14 and 16 are article of manufacture claims (computer program product) containing the limitations similarly disclosed in the system claims 1-5, 7, and 8 and are rejected under the same rationale.

e. Regarding claim 20, Thomas teaches: monitoring operation of the electronic equipment at a first device (paragraphs [0017] and [0021] on page 2 and interprocess server 52 of Fig. 2); receiving, at the first device, an information request regarding the electronic equipment from a network browser application of a requesting

device remote from the first device (paragraphs [0022-0023] on pages 2-3); attempting at the first device, to determine whether the requesting device currently stores a desired version of a computer-executable user-interface program (paragraphs [0022-0023] on page 2-3).

Thomas does not explicitly teach: executing the computer-executable user-interface program at the requesting device to produce a user interface for providing information regarding the operation of the electronic equipment, the interface being in a first format that is distinct from a second format associated with the network browser application. However, Nevarez discloses: "A remote provider 246 provides object access through a remote bridge 248 and the UCS product 224. The remote provider 246 may provide access, for instance, to an OLE component 236 by using remoting technology to get through to a Windows NT or OLE server 106. This may include tunneling through an "NSAPI" Netscape web server API and/or an "ISAPI" Windows NT web server API. The remote provider 230 accepts calls from the object model adapter 246, uses standard network technology such as the remote bridge 248 to contact remote objects, and relays parameters and results. The remote provider 230 may communicate via the network with another remote provider 246 at the remote location, or it may communicate with another object model provider (e.g., provider 242, 238, or 232), or with remote UCS product code as illustrated," (lines 39-53 of column 10, wherein the Remote Provider 246 is the second I/O unit which provides the program to a remote computer through remoting technology such as tunneling). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to

execute the computer-executable user-interface program at the requesting device to produce a user interface for providing information regarding the operation of the electronic equipment, the interface being in a first format that is distinct from a second format associated with the network browser application. "In short, the UCS architecture 200, like the inventive architecture in other embodiments, provides versatility by letting a programmer use any programming language in the system to access any reusable component in the system," (lines 63-66 of column 10); and "The UCS architecture 200 thus provides a middle-tier solution for development on the NetWare platform. It makes the existing NetWare services relatively easy to consume and build into Internet and intranet solutions, and it provides an open standards-based solution. Because components may be run on either the local server or on a remote server, developers can use components that do not exist in the local execution environment. Remoting of components may be done through an event-passing protocol that leverages Web technologies such as TCP/IP," (lines 11-20 of column 11). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to execute the computer-executable user-interface program at the requesting device to produce a user interface for providing information regarding the operation of the electronic equipment, the interface being in a first format that is distinct from a second format associated with the network browser application in the system as taught by Thomas.

f. Claims 22-25 and 28-29 are method claims containing the limitations similarly disclosed in the system claims 1-5, 7, and 8 and are rejected under the same

rationale.

g. Regarding claim 26, Thomas teaches: transferring an address of a network server accessible from the remote device to the remote device and accessing the network server from the remote device and transferring to the remote device at least one of the user-interface program and a loader program configured to determine whether a desired version of the user-interface program is stored in association with the remote device (paragraphs [0022-0023] on pages 2-3 and paragraph [0034] on page 4).

h. Regarding claim 30, Thomas teaches: executing an interface-producing program to produce a graphical-window-based user interface on a display of a first device for providing information regarding the operation of electronic equipment (paragraph [0019] on page 2 and paragraphs [0022-0023] on pages 2-3); and determining whether a desired version of the interface-producing program is stored in association with the first device (paragraphs [0022-0023] on page 2-3).

Thomas does not explicitly teach: wherein the electronic equipment is monitored by a second device remote from the first device. However, Nevarez discloses: "A remote provider 246 provides object access through a remote bridge 248 and the UCS product 224. The remote provider 246 may provide access, for instance, to an OLE component 236 by using remoting technology to get through to a Windows NT or OLE server 106. This may include tunneling through an "NSAPI" Netscape web server API and/or an "ISAPI" Windows NT web server API. The remote provider 230 accepts calls from the object model adapter 246, uses standard network technology such as the remote bridge 248 to contact remote objects, and relays parameters and results. The

remote provider 230 may communicate via the network with another remote provider 246 at the remote location, or it may communicate with another object model provider (e.g., provider 242, 238, or 232), or with remote UCS product code as illustrated," (lines 39-53 of column 10, wherein the Remote Provider 246 is the second I/O unit which provides the program to a remote computer through remoting technology such as tunneling). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have electronic equipment monitored by a second device remote from the first device. "The UCS architecture 200 thus provides a middle-tier solution for development on the NetWare platform. It makes the existing NetWare services relatively easy to consume and build into Internet and intranet solutions, and it provides an open standards-based solution. Because components may be run on either the local server or on a remote server, developers can use components that do not exist in the local execution environment. Remoting of components may be done through an event-passing protocol that leverages Web technologies such as TCP/IP," (lines 11-20 of column 11). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have electronic equipment monitored by a second device remote from the first device in the system as taught by Thomas.

i. Regarding claim 31, Thomas teaches: the instructions are configured to cause the computer to access a remote server and download the desired version of the interface-producing program if the computer program product fails to cause the computer to determine that the desired version of the interface-producing program is

stored in association with the first device (paragraphs [0022-0023] on pages 2-3 and paragraph [0034] on page 4).

j. Regarding claim 32, Thomas teaches: wherein the interface-provisioning device is configured to convey the computer-executable program toward the computer via the second input/output device and the communication network in response to a determination that the computer is not presently storing a latest version of the computer-executable program (paragraph [0003] on page 1 and paragraph [0022-0023] on page 2-3).

k. Regarding claim 33, Thomas teaches: wherein the interface-provisioning device is configured to make the determination that the remote computer is not presently storing the latest version of the computer-executable program paragraphs [0022-0023] on page 2-3.

6. Claims 9, 17, and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas and Nevarez as applied above, in view of Potega (U.S. 6,459,175 B1).

a. Regarding claim 9, Thomas teaches a power supply (inherent in any computerized system) but does not explicitly teach AC power input, DC power source, an output circuit including a power output, and a switch coupled to the AC input, the DC source, and the output circuit, and configured to couple the AC input or DC source to the output circuit. However, Potega discloses: "Power supplies are traditionally device-specific, in that the output voltage of the power converter, whether it be an AC/DC or DC/DC adapter, must be voltage-matched to the host device it was designed to power,"

(lines 16-19 of column 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have an AC power input, DC power source, an output circuit including a power output, and a switch coupled to the AC input, the DC source, and the output circuit, and configured to couple the AC input or DC source to the output circuit. "Output voltage of the power converter, whether it be an AC/DC or DC/DC adapter, must be voltage-matched to the host device it was designed to power," (lines 17-19 of column 1 in Potega). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have an AC power input, DC power source, an output circuit including a power output, and a switch coupled to the AC input, the DC source, and the output circuit, and configured to couple the AC input or DC source to the output circuit in the system as taught by Thomas.

b. Regarding claim 17, Thomas teaches: power supply (inherent in any computerized system), a first I/O device configured to couple to the electric equipment (paragraph [0017] on page 2); a monitor coupled to the first I/O device and configured to determine information regarding the electric equipment (paragraphs [0017] and [0021] of page 2); a second I/O device coupled to the monitor and configured to communicate with the communication network, the monitor being configured to provide the information regarding the electric equipment to the communication network via the second I/O device (paragraph [0019] on page 2 and paragraphs [0022-0023] on pages 2-3); a memory that stored a computer-executable program configured to be executed by a computer to provide a computer interface for providing indicia of the information regarding the electric equipment, the computer interface being in a format that is distinct

from a network browser format. (paragraphs [0022-0023] on pages 2-3); and an interface-provisioning device coupled to the memory and the second I/O device and configured to convey the computer-executable program toward the computer via the second I/O device and the communication network (paragraph [0003] on page 1 and paragraph [0022-0023] on page 2-3); wherein each of the first and second I/O devices, the monitor, the memory, and the interface-provisioning device are disposed at least partially in the housing (paragraph [0017] and Fig. 1 and 2).

Thomas does not explicitly teach: the second I/O device communicating with a remote computer; the program being executed by a remote computer; conveying the program toward the remote computer; AC power input, DC power source, an output circuit including a power output, and a controllable switch coupled to the AC power input, the DC power source, and the output circuit, and configured to selectively couple at least one of the AC power input or DC power source to the output circuit. However, Nevarez discloses: "A remote provider 246 provides object access through a remote bridge 248 and the UCS product 224. The remote provider 246 may provide access, for instance, to an OLE component 236 by using remoting technology to get through to a Windows NT or OLE server 106. This may include tunneling through an "NSAPI" Netscape web server API and/or an "ISAPI" Windows NT web server API. The remote provider 230 accepts calls from the object model adapter 246, uses standard network technology such as the remote bridge 248 to contact remote objects, and relays parameters and results. The remote provider 230 may communicate via the network with another remote provider 246 at the remote location, or it may communicate with

another object model provider (e.g., provider 242, 238, or 232), or with remote UCS product code as illustrated," (lines 39-53 of column 10, wherein the Remote Provider 246 is the second I/O unit which provides the program to a remote computer through remoting technology such as tunneling). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the second I/O device communicate with a remote computer; have the program executed by a remote computer; and convey the program toward the remote computer.

"In short, the UCS architecture 200, like the inventive architecture in other embodiments, provides versatility by letting a programmer use any programming language in the system to access any reusable component in the system," (lines 63-66 of column 10); and "The UCS architecture 200 thus provides a middle-tier solution for development on the NetWare platform. It makes the existing NetWare services relatively easy to consume and build into Internet and intranet solutions, and it provides an open standards-based solution. Because components may be run on either the local server or on a remote server, developers can use components that do not exist in the local execution environment. Remoting of components may be done through an event-passing protocol that leverages Web technologies such as TCP/IP," (lines 11-20 of column 11). It is for these reasons that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the second I/O device communicate with a remote computer; have the program executed by a remote computer; and convey the program toward the remote computer in the system as taught by Thomas.

Regarding: AC power input, DC power source, an output circuit including a power output, and a controllable switch coupled to the AC input, the DC source, and the output circuit, and configured to couple the AC input or DC source to the output circuit, Potega discloses: "Power supplies are traditionally device-specific, in that the output voltage of the power converter, whether it be an AC/DC or DC/DC adapter, must be voltage-matched to the host device it was designed to power," (lines 16-19 of column 1). Additionally, Potega discloses: "The power input connection has a controllable switch, so that the input voltage can be sent to one of the two power converter modules," (lines 55-57 of column 40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have an AC power input, DC power source, an output circuit including a power output, and a switch coupled to the AC input, the DC source, and the output circuit, and configured to couple the AC input or DC source to the output circuit. "Output voltage of the power converter, whether it be an AC/DC or DC/DC adapter, must be voltage-matched to the host device it was designed to power," (lines 17-19 of column 1 in Potega). Also, "The AC/DC converter is wired directly to the DC/DC unit, so that the Variable DC Output module provides all power output of the unit. Operating the power as a 28 VDC voltage regulator is important. Were this circuit to be on a commercial airliner, the choice of 28 VDC input would have significant benefits. Such multi-output power supplies on aircraft are specifically for passengers to power their laptop computers. Since laptop computers require a power signal anywhere from 10-24 VDC, stepping down from a 28-volt source makes for good power efficiency," (lines 3-13 of column 41 in Potega). It is for these reasons that one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have an AC power input, DC power source, an output circuit including a power output, and a switch coupled to the AC input, the DC source, and the output circuit, and configured to couple the AC input or DC source to the output circuit in the system as taught by Thomas

c. Regarding claim 19, Thomas teaches: the interface is a Windows-based interface (paragraphs [0022-0023] on page 2-3).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 25 September 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. (A) Regarding claim 1, the applicant contends Nevarez does not teach conveying the program toward the remote computer. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

As to point (A), the applicant argues that Nevarez instead describes that the remote provider provides access to objects, but the objects are not conveyed over a network. The examiner points additionally to lines 54-60 of column 10 which state: "Each provider includes code written to the UCS product (or other embodiment) using a particular API set tailored to the object model for which the provider provides objects and object access. The providers included with the UCS product release allow the

writing of scripts and programs which dynamically load only the functionality required at execution time." From this recitation, it is clear that the dynamically loaded scripts and programs are in fact conveyed towards the remote computer for use at execution time. As such, the rejection remains proper and is maintained by the examiner.

9. (B) Regarding claim 20, the applicant contends that Thomas and Nevarez do not teach: receiving, at the first device, an information request regarding the electronic equipment from a network browser application of a requesting device remote from the first device, and executing a computer-executable user- interface program at the requesting device to produce a user interface for providing information regarding the operation of the electronic equipment. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

As to point (B), the applicant provides no support for this argument other than stating that claims 1-5, 7, and 8 do not recite this limitation. However, the rejection of claim 20 has been restated above with citations.

10. (C) Regarding claims 20, 30, and 31, the applicant contends that Thomas and Nevarez do not teach attempting, at the first device, to determine whether the requesting device currently stores a desired version of a computer-executable user-interface program. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

As to point (C), the applicant argues that at best, Thomas teaches a method for a remote user to identify the version of a relay device. Paragraph [0022] on page 2 of Thomas explicitly states: "Inter-process server 52 is provided by the system through a

utility in a Human-Machine Interface (HMI) package. A configuration and control interface for the inter-process server is provided through server application window menus (not shown). Associated with inter-process server 52 are logical data tables 54 and related modules, i.e., an Excel or other process-aware applications module 56, a waveform capture module 58, an event logger module 60, productivity modules 62, and a HMI module 64." The configuration and control interface and handle any version checking in the system. As such, the rejection remains proper and is maintained by the examiner.

11. (D) Regarding claims 17 and 19, the applicant argues limitations similarly discussed above with reference to point (A).

12. (E) The applicant's remaining arguments are directed towards subject matter discussed above with reference to points (A) through (C) and provide no additional support for these arguments.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Meucci at (571) 272-3892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for this Group is 571-273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.meucci@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442